# Young Money AC

# Part I is Framework

I affirm the resolution, on balance.

I value morality.

#### Ontological questioning through self-referential freedom is an essential part to morality. Webster 02:

Scott Webster (on the faculty of education @ Monash University) “Existentialism: Providing an ideal framework for educational research in times of uncertainty.” Paper Presented at the AARE Annual Conference, Brisbane, 2002.

**There is encouragement from existential writers for one** **to choose authentically oneself** (Heidegger, 1988, p. 170; Kierkegaard, 1987, vol.2, p. 259), **and to create and own one's** **possibilities**. **Consequently,** **this framework is** quite **different from those that emphasize the immersion of the individual in** particular **traditions** of various world-views **or discourses**. **Such models only consider the internal consistency offered by formal frameworks or the diversity of** **world-views** 'out there', **without including the aspect of personal relevance being made with its associated ownership and commitment.** **These models could potentially promote only an inauthentic existence**. The **existential framework** goes beyond this, and **addresses the aspect of how an individual relates to and possibly** **finds** personal **significance and meaning in world-views, by exercising freedom to choose these meanings to be his or her own. 'Meaning' is always a derivative of the intention of beings and is not intrinsic to other entities** (Bruner, 1990; Morris, 1992, p. 57; Smagorinsky, 1995, p. 165).

#### Ontological questioning is a prerequisite to moral code because it makes it binding. Webster 2:

While **one is never completely able to authenticate or even to recognize all the meanings one has gained from being culturally embedded, the authentic use of one's existential freedom enables one to recognize and make possibilities for oneself.** The exercising of one's agency is understood to be contingent and is not absolute. **Cultural and institutional frameworks which offer universal meanings should be engaged with by the individual who authentically is able to contextualize them with regards to his or her own experiences.** Possibilities can be produced through such encounters which are then understood to be personally owned. **Consequently as one chooses one's possibilities with regards to how one gives meaning and purpose to all of one's activities, one accepts ownership and therefore responsibility for committing one's existence and therefore all of one's decisions to the understanding that one has. Through this authenticating of the individual, a passionate commitment that gives meaning and purpose to the way that one exists can be developed.**

#### Theories about freedom and politics are bankrupt unless they’re situated within a correct account of the human condition—the existentialist account of freedom provides the best account

**Manzi 13**

Yvonne Manzi (University of Kent). “Jean-Paul Sartre: Existential “Freedom” and the Political.” E-International Relations Students. January 23rd, 2013. <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/01/23/jean-paul-sartre-existential-freedom-and-the-political/>

\*\*Gender modified

Philosophers have been pondering the notion of freedom for thousands of years. From Thucydides, through to Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, John Stuart Mill and Jean Jacques Rousseau, the concept of freedom has continually been dealt with to some degree in political thought. This is an important concept because we must decide whether individuals are free, whether they should be free, what this means and what kinds of institutions we are to build around these ideas. In political thought, the notion of freedom can be looked at through the lens of Isaiah Berlin’s renowned essay “Two Concepts of Liberty”. He begins with stating that in political philosophy, the dominant issue is the question of obedience and coercion. Why should an individual obey anyone else? May individuals be coerced? Why should we all not live as we like? These are all questions of freedom. In a long and detailed discussion, Berlin then makes the distinction between positive and negative freedom.[1] Carter clearly and concisely explains the distinction; “negative liberty is the absence of obstacles, barriers or constraints… Positive liberty is the possibility of acting … in such a way as to take control of one’s life” (2008). Key to negative freedom[2] is the notion of non-interference. One only lacks political liberty if he/she is “prevented from attaining a goal by human beings” (Berlin 1969, 122). Simply being incapable of achieving a goal (such as not being able to fly like a bird or not being able to walk because of an injury) does not count as being un-free in this sense. There are numerous political philosophers who fall under this category outlined by Berlin. They agree on the definition of freedom but disagree about how wide it should be. Two of these philosophers are Thomas Hobbes and John Locke.[3] Because in the state of nature human goals cannot be harmonised, these classical thinkers assumed that human freedom must be limited by law. However, they also recognised that a minimum area of human freedom should also be protected in order to allow for the basic human capacities/qualities to develop. For Hobbes, individuals must surrender all of their rights to the Leviathan under a social contract, except for one fundamental right – the right to self-preservation (Hobbes 1651). For Locke, the ‘minimal’ area of protected freedom for each individual is a bit broader in that individuals have rights to their property and to the fruits of their labour (Locke 1689). There is infinite debate in that “we cannot remain absolutely free, and must give up some of our liberty to preserve the rest. But total self-surrender is self-defeating” (Berlin 1969, 126). Positive freedom is ‘positive’ in the sense that individuals will want to be their own masters. In Berlin’s words, by virtue of positive freedom, one will “wish to be a subject, not an object” (1969, 131). Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s notion of ‘true liberty’ may be placed under this category. Individuals should pursue an ideal of ‘true liberty’ in which they will be able to achieve their full human potential and live virtuously. True liberty is achieved when individuals can let go of amour propre (the love of oneself) and instead become possessed by amour de soi (the desire for self-preservation and self-mastery) (Rousseau 1762). Positive freedom therefore is less about what individuals are forbidden from doing, and more about what individuals can do to reach their full human potential. Under a state of positive freedom “I wish, above all, to be conscious of myself as a thinking, willing, active being, bearing responsibility for my choices and able to explain them by references to my own ideas and purposes” (Berlin 1969, 131). The point I would like to make is that Berlin’s approach in dealing with the concept of freedom is not enough. All the thinkers I have mentioned relate to something which we can call political freedom as opposed to philosophical freedom.[4] Jean-Paul Sartre discusses the latter. In his essay, Berlin claims that “conceptions of freedom directly derive from views of what constitutes a self” (1969, 134). What Sartre does is precisely this; he begins with an understanding of the subject and of ‘human nature’ that is different from all the aforementioned ones, and he arrives at a conception of freedom that is just as different. I argue that Sartre’s concept of freedom should not have been omitted from debates in political thought. I am not arguing that Sartre’s conception of freedom should be inserted into Berlin’s framework, nor am I arguing that Berlin overlooked him. I am arguing that Berlin’s discussion is not enough. We need a conception of freedom that operates at the level of the political, because it is on top of the political that everything else in politics is built. I take the political to be the field of relations below ‘politics’. This is where the conditions for understanding politics are shaped. Chantal Mouffe makes a similar distinction; she borrows Heidegger’s vocabulary and claims that “politics refers to the ontic level, while ‘the political’ has to do with the ontological one”[5] (Mouffe 2005, 8). The ontic generally refers to physical or factual reality, while the ontological refers to ‘being’, or the first-person phenomenological experience (Heidegger 1927). In this case, the two terms are slightly adapted to the theory. Politics is at the ontic level because it has to do with the conventional practices and policies, while the political is at the ontological level because, for Mouffe, it concerns the ‘being’ of society, or in her words “the very way in which society is instituted” (2005, 9). Existentialism and Jean-Paul Sartre Existentialist[6] philosophers such as Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre were well-known in their time for being involved in resistance, unforgiving of collaborationism and conformity, and for having an active interest in revolutionary movements[7]. When coupled with the fact that freedom is one of the most significant themes that are examined by existentialist philosophers, one wonders why this branch of philosophy has not been more appropriately dealt with in political thought. Perhaps it is because existentialism indeed appears to be more of a life-philosophy than a tradition fit for the conception of political theory and policy. I argue that before political theories, policies and institutions can be conceived, one must first be able to appropriately situate the human condition. Existentialism provides a unique and compelling account of what it means to be ‘human’, which allows for Sartre’s conception of freedom to be reasonably developed. What is primarily worth noting is the context in which the existentialist ideas of Jean-Paul Sartre arose. After the world wars, there was a break down in traditional ideas of philosophy. There was no true sense of community, no faith in human nature, and an increasing belief that perhaps the divine did not truly exist if it allowed for atrocities such as the holocaust to happen (Flynn 2006). Philosophy had to return to its origins; ‘what do we know and how do we know it?’ was the question. Existentialists answered ‘all we really know is that we exist’. Existentialism therefore revolves around questions of existence and the human experience. We will start from the same position – notions of existence and subjectivity. Existentialists maintain that we cannot know anything if not from our subjectivity. The first and only real thing we know is that we exist and that we experience everything subjectively. This leads us into questions of being. Hegel distinguished between the being of objects (being-in-itself), and human Being (or Geist) – this provided one of the bases for Sartre’s later distinction (Hegel 1807). Heidegger provided a second contribution, which in a sense defines the core of this philosophical tradition. He claimed that we cannot reflect on the meaning of being in relation to our existence, if we do not first understand it philosophically[8] (Heidegger 1927). Heidegger especially critiqued the Cartesian question of existence, claiming that such a question arises from an ontologically inadequate beginning (Ibid, 83). He criticised the notion of substance, and he argued that individuals are Dasein, or ‘beings-in-the-world’. Inherent in the existentialist tradition are also ideas of meaninglessness and angst. Sartre, as an atheist, rejected the idea that there is a divine meaning to one’s life or that there is a purpose for which each individual is born. In The Myth of Sisyphus (2000), Camus introduced the notion of absurdity which arises from the clash between the world’s resounding silence (meaninglessness) and the individual’s expectation of purpose or direction. Heidegger also accepted this, and in Being and Time he maintained that the realisation of this meaninglessness leads to a feeling of Angst (1927, 173).[9] “What oppresses us is not this or that, nor is it everything objectively present together as a sum, but the possibility of things at hand in general, that is, the world itself” (Ibid, 175). For Heidegger, Dasein is not only ‘being-in-the-world’, but also ‘potentiality-for-being’. Sartre, in a similar fashion, claims that individuals can surpass themselves and pursue possibilities outside of themselves (Sartre 2007, 66). A last notion which is worth mentioning is primarily a Sartrean one; that of authenticity. “Existence is authentic to the extent that the existent[10] has taken possession of himself and… has moulded [themselves] himself in [their] his own image” (Macquarrie 1972, 206). When the individual does not allow himself to be moulded and bound by outside rules and morals, when he “exercises freedom rather than being determined by the prevailing public tastes and standards”[11] (Ibid, 207), then he lives an authentic existence. In the coming section, where I will examine Sartre’s conception of freedom in detail, the bond between these existentialist concepts will become much clearer. In his magnum opus, Being and Nothingness, Sartre gives a highly complex, interesting and compelling account of existentialist freedom. In addition, he is one of the only philosophers who openly endorsed the existential philosophy, accepting the term ‘existentialist’. The existential notion of freedom is worthy of consideration in political thought because it is a “doctrine of action” (Sartre 2007, 56), which pushes [people] man to find [themselves] himself again. In Sartre’s words, the intention of existentialism “is not in the least that of plunging men into despair” as it is to allow them to realise themselves as ‘truly human’ (Ibid). But what does this mean and is it relevant to political thought? I argue that it is. It is precisely because Sartre’s philosophy seeks to allow men to realise themselves as truly human that he should not be omitted in political thought. Philosophers such as Rousseau, Locke and Hobbes have all attempted to provide an account of human nature upon which to build a notion of freedom and politics. Sartre situates the notion of freedom at that first, philosophical level. Jean-Paul Sartre’s “Freedom” “Never have we been as free as during the German occupation… Since the Nazi venom snuck even into our thoughts, every correct thought was a conquest; since an all-powerful police tried to keep us silent, every word became previous like a declaration of principle; since we were watched, every gesture had the weight of a commitment… The very cruelty of the enemy pushed us to the extremity of the human condition by forcing us to ask the questions which we can ignore in peacetime” (Sartre in Gerassi 1989).[12] Freedom for Sartre is not the freedom to do something. He says “you are free” because you always have a choice, “therefore choose” (Sartre 2007). But because this creates anxiety and anguish, individuals flee in self-deception and continue leading inauthentic lives. Man is free when his consciousness acknowledges that something is lacking, when he makes a purpose of himself, and when he commits. In Sartre’s words, this is when he “transcends” himself. This was done well under occupation because what was lacking then was evident, almost palpable. Consequently, he argues, every action became a commitment. Man was thus asserting his freedom. He does not seek to say that individuals in peacetime are under illusory freedom. In peacetime they simply do not think about the same issues, and they are much less likely to realise what to be human truly means.

For one to even engage ethics, they must believe their actions to have value which is contingent on valuing being **and** because moral code must be self-compelling or else it isn’t normative, only a moral code that engages the individual and gives them reason to find meaning in action can be normative.

There are two additional warrants:

#### All of our understanding of the world is based on experience. Hume 48:

David Hume (Philosopher, historian, economist, one of the most important figures in empiricism and enlightenment skepticism (not moral skep, it’s different)) Edited by an Copyrights Jonathan Bennett 2010-2015; “Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding” Online Publishing: July 2014, Original Publishing: 1748. Accessed 12/1/14. Pgs. 8-9. <http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfs/hume1748.pdf>

\*\*Brackets for gendered language/clarity\*\*
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**But although our thought seems to be so free, when we look more carefully we’ll find that [thought] is really confined within very narrow limits, and that all this creative power of the mind amounts merely to the ability to combine, transpose, enlarge, or shrink the materials that the senses and experience provide us with. When we think of a golden mountain, we only join two consistent ideas—gold and mountain—with which we were already familiar.** We can conceive a virtuous horse because our own feelings enable us to conceive virtue, and we can join this with the shape of a horse, which is an animal we know. **In short, all the materials of thinking are derived either from our outward senses or from our inward feelings**: all that the mind and will do is to mix and combine these materials. Put in philosophical terminology: all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones. Here are **two arguments** that I hope will suffice to **prove this.** **(1) When we analyse our thoughts or ideas—however complex or elevated they are—we always find [they are] to be made up of simple ideas that were copied from earlier feelings or sensations. Even ideas that at first glance seem to be the furthest removed from that origin are found on closer examination to be derived from it. The idea of God—meaning an infinitely intelligent, wise, and good Being—comes from extending beyond all limits the qualities of goodness and wisdom that we find in our own minds.** However far we push this enquiry, we shall find that every idea that we examine is copied from a similar impression. Those who maintain that this isn’t universally true and that there are exceptions to it have only one way of refuting it—but it should be easy for them, if they are right. They need merely to produce an idea that they think isn’t derived from this source. It will then be up to me, if I am to maintain my doctrine, to point to the impression or lively perception that corresponds to the idea they have produced. **(2) If a [person] can’t have some kind of sensation because there is something wrong with [their] eyes, ears etc., [they] will never be found to have corresponding ideas. A blind [person] can’t form a notion of colours, or a deaf [person] a notion of sounds. If either is cured of [their] deafness or blindness, so that the sensations can get through to [them], the ideas can then get through as well; and then [the person] will find it easy to conceive these objects.** The same is true for someone who has never experienced an object that will give a certain kind of sensation: a Laplander or Negro has no notion of the taste of wine ·because he has never had the sensation of tasting wine. Similarly with inward feelings. It seldom if ever happens that a person has never felt or is wholly incapable of some human feeling or emotion, but the phenomenon I am describing does occur with feelings as well, though in lesser degree. A gentle person can’t form any idea of determined revenge or cruelty; nor can a selfish one easily conceive the heights of friendship and generosity. Everyone agrees that non-human beings may have many senses of which we can have no conception, because the ideas of them have never been introduced to us in the only way in which an idea can get into the mind, namely through actual feeling and sensation.

#### And, human existence precedes essence because humans have no concrete intended role. Sartre 46:

ean Paul Sartre (Philosopher, Nobel Prize Winner) “Existentialism is a Humanism” Accessed 12/1/14 at <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/sartre/works/exist/sartre.htm> which cites Existentialism from Dostoyevsky to Sartre, ed. Walter Kaufman, Meridian Publishing Company, 1989. Originally a lecture given in 1946.

\*\*Bracketed for gendered language\*\*

If one considers an article of manufacture as, for example, a book or a paper-knife – one sees that it has been made by an artisan who had a conception of it; and he has paid attention, equally, to the conception of a paper-knife and to the pre-existent technique of production which is a part of that conception and is, at bottom, a formula. Thus the paper-knife is at the same time an article producible in a certain manner and one which, on the other hand, serves a definite purpose, for one cannot suppose that a man would produce a paper-knife without knowing what it was for. Let us say, then, of the paperknife that its essence – that is to say the sum of the formulae and the qualities which made its production and its definition possible – precedes its existence. The presence of such-and-such a paper-knife or book is thus determined before my eyes. Here, then, we are viewing the world from a technical standpoint, and we can say that production precedes existence. When we think of God as the creator, we are thinking of him, most of the time, as a supernal artisan. Whatever doctrine we may be considering, whether it be a doctrine like that of Descartes, or of Leibnitz himself, we always imply that the will follows, more or less, from the understanding or at least accompanies it, so that when God creates he knows precisely what he is creating. Thus, the conception of man in the mind of God is comparable to that of the paper-knife in the mind of the artisan: God makes man according to a procedure and a conception, exactly as the artisan manufactures a paper-knife, following a definition and a formula. Thus each individual man is the realization of a certain conception which dwells in the divine understanding. In the philosophic atheism of the eighteenth century, the notion of God is suppressed, but not, for all that, the idea that essence is prior to existence; something of that idea we still find everywhere, in Diderot, in Voltaire and even in Kant. Man possesses a human nature; that “human nature,” which is the conception of human being, is found in every man; which means that each man is a particular example of a universal conception, the conception of Man. In Kant, this universality goes so far that the wild man of the woods, man in the state of nature and the bourgeois are all contained in the same definition and have the same fundamental qualities. Here again, the essence of man precedes that historic existence which we confront in experience. Atheistic existentialism, of which I am a representative, declares with greater consistency that **if God does not exist there is at least one being whose existence comes before its essence, a being which exists before it can be defined by any conception of it.** That being is man or, as Heidegger has it, the human reality. What do we mean by saying that existence precedes essence? **We mean that [humans] first of all exists, encounters himself, surges up in the world – and defines [itself] afterwards.** If man as the existentialist sees him is not definable, it is because to begin with he is nothing. He will not be anything until later, and then he will be what he makes of himself. **Thus, there is no human nature, because there is no God to have a conception of it.** Man simply is. Not that he is simply what he conceives himself to be, but he is what he wills, and as he conceives himself after already existing – as he wills to be after that leap towards existence. Man is nothing else but that which he makes of himself. That is the first principle of existentialism. And this is what people call its “subjectivity,” using the word as a reproach against us. But what do we mean to say by this, but that man is of a greater dignity than a stone or a table? **For we mean to say that man primarily exists – that [humankind] is, before all else, something which propels itself towards a future and is aware that it is doing so. [Humankind] is, indeed, a project which possesses a subjective life, instead of being a kind of moss, or a fungus or a cauliflower. Before that projection of the self-nothing exists; not even in the heaven of intelligence: [humankind] will only attain existence when [humankind] is what [it] purposes to be. Not, however, what [humankind] may wish to be.** For what we usually understand by wishing or willing is a conscious decision taken – much more often than not – after we have made ourselves what we are. I may wish to join a party, to write a book or to marry – but in such a case what is usually called my will is probably a manifestation of a prior and more spontaneous decision. **If, however, it is true that existence is prior to essence, [people are] responsible for what [they are].** Thus, the first effect of existentialism is that it puts every [person] in possession of [themselves] as he is, and places the entire responsibility for [their] existence squarely upon [their] own shoulders. And, when we say that man is responsible for himself, we do not mean that he is responsible only for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all [humans]. The word “subjectivism” is to be understood in two senses, and our adversaries play upon only one of them. Subjectivism means, on the one hand, the freedom of the individual subject and, on the other, that man cannot pass beyond human subjectivity. **It is the latter which is the deeper meaning of existentialism. When we say that [one] chooses [oneself], we do mean that every one of us must choose [oneself]; but by that we also mean that in choosing for [oneself] [one] chooses for all [persons]. For in effect, of all the actions [one] may take in order to create [oneself] as [one] wills to be, there is not one which is not creative, at the same time, of an image of [oneself] such as [one] believes [one] ought to be. To choose between this or that is at the same time to affirm the value of that which is chosen; for we are unable ever to choose the worse.** What we choose is always the better; and nothing can be better for us unless it is better for all. If, moreover, existence precedes essence and we will to exist at the same time as we fashion our image, that image is valid for all and for the entire epoch in which we find ourselves. Our responsibility is thus much greater than we had supposed, for it concerns mankind as a whole. If I am a worker, for instance, I may choose to join a Christian rather than a Communist trade union. And if, by that membership, I choose to signify that resignation is, after all, the attitude that best becomes a man, that man’s kingdom is not upon this earth, I do not commit myself alone to that view. Resignation is my will for everyone, and my action is, in consequence, a commitment on behalf of all mankind. Or if, to take a more personal case, I decide to marry and to have children, even though this decision proceeds simply from my situation, from my passion or my desire, I am thereby committing not only myself, but humanity as a whole, to the practice of monogamy. I am thus responsible for myself and for all men, and I am creating a certain image of man as I would have him to be. In fashioning myself I fashion man.

This means four things:

a) All understandings of the world derive from experiences that individuals have, if moral frameworks generate themselves off of presupposed standards for humanity then it cannot generate normative understanding

**And**

b) Since persons have no identifiable constitutive purpose, moral considerations should consider analysis of existence first because it is the only method to find meaning in being which is prerequisite to moral obligations.

**And**

c) Proving the existence of god is a prerequisite to disproving the AC framework because otherwise there’s no basis for an absolute meaning to human life and thus you default to analyzing existence first.

**And**

d) A prerequisite to debate is ontological investigation that holds normative truths secondary. On any topic, the “morally right” side does not win every round, our personal experiences and investigation of the issue is more important than the “truth”. This is a theoretical reason to hold the aff framework first.

Therefore the standard is **promoting people’s freedom to create their existential meaning.**

#### And this means accepting the risk of bad decisions, risk is inherent – an unchallengable fear about any and all bad consequences destroys everything worth living for. This risk is nonunique and is the logic of discrimination against persons and values.

**Der Derian 93**  
James Der Derian (professor of political science at the U Massachusetts-Amherst and prof of IR at Brown) 1993  
"The political subject of violence" ed. David Campbell and Michael Dillon, p 101-105

Nietzsche and Interpretive Realism In the last analysis, "love of the neighbor" is always something secondary, partly conventional and arbitrary—illusory in relation to fear of the neigh-bor. After the structure of society is fixed on the whole and seems secure against external dangers, it is this fear of the neighbor that again creates new perspectives of moral valuation. —Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil Nietzsche transvalues both Hobbcss and Marx's interpretations of securi-ty through a genealogy of modes of being. His method is not to uncover some deep meaning or value for security, but to destabilize the intolerable fiaional identities of the past which have been created out of fear, and to affirm the creative differences which might yield new values for the future.33 Originating in the paradoxical relationship of a contingent life and a certain death, the history of security reads for Nietzsche as an abnegation, a resentment and, finally, a transcendence of this paradox. In brief, the history is one of individuals seeking an impossible security from the most radical "other" of life, the terror of death which, once generalized and nationalized, triggers a futile cycle of collective identities seeking security from alien others—who are seeking similarly impossible guarantees. It is a story of differences taking on the otherness of death, and identities calcifying into a fearful sameness. Since Nietzsche has suffered the greatest neglect in international theory, his reinterprctation of security will receive a more extensive treatment here. One must begin with Nietzsche's idea of the will to power, which he clearly believed to be prior to and generative of all considerations of security. In Beyond Good and Evil, he emphatically establishes the primacy of the will to power: "Physiologists should think before putting down the instinct of self-preservation as the cardinal instinct of an organic being. A living thing seeks above all to discharge its strength—life itself is will to power; self-preservation is only one of the most frequent results."34 The will to power, then, should not be confused with a Hobbesian perpetual desire for power. It can, in its negative form, produce a reactive and resentful longing for only power, leading, in Nietzsche's view, to a triumph of nihilism. But Nietzsche refers to a positive will to power, an active and affective force of becoming, from which values and meanings—including self-preservation—are produced which affirm life. Conventions of security act to suppress rather than confront the fears endemic to life, for "... life itself is essentially appropriation, injury, overpowering of what is alien and weaker; suppression, hardness, imposition of ones own forms, incorporation and at least, at its mildest, exploitation—but why should one always use those words in which slanderous intent has been imprinted for ages."35 Elsewhere Nietzsche establishes the pervasiveness of agonism in life: "life is a consequence of war, society itself a means to war.” But the denial of this permanent condition, the effort to disguise it with a con-sensual rationality or to hide from it with a fictional sovereignty, are all effects of this suppression of fear. The desire for security is manifested as a collective resentment of difference—that which is not us, not certain, not predictable. Complicit with a negative will to power is the fear-driven desire for protection from the unknown. Unlike the positive will to power, which produces an aesthetic affirmation of difference, the search for truth produces a truncated life which conforms to the rationally knowable, to the causally sustainable. In The Gay Science, Nietzsche asks of the reader "Look, isn't our need for knowledge precisely this need for the familiar, the will to uncover everything strange, unusual, and questionable, something that no longer disturbs us? Is it not the instinct of fear that bids us to know? And is the jubi lation of those who obtain knowledge not the jubilation over the restora-tion of a sense of security?\*\*37 The fear of the unknown and the desire for certainty combine to produce a domesticated life, in which causality and rationality become the highest sign of a sovereign self, the surest protection against contingent forces. The fear of fate assures a belief that everything reasonable is true, and everything true, reasonable. In short, the security imperative pro-duces, and is sustained by, the strategies of knowledge which seek to explain it. Nietzsche elucidates the nature of this generative relationship in The Twilight of the Idols-. The causal instinct is thus conditional upon, and excited by, the feeling of fear. The "why?\*1 shall, if at all possible, not give the cause for its own sake so much as for a particular kind of cause—a cause (hat is comforting, liber-ating and relieving. . . . That which is new and strange and has not been experienced before, is excluded as a cause. Thus one not only searches for some kind of explanation, to serve as a cause, but for a particularly selected and preferred kind of explanation—that which most quickly and frequently abolished the feeling of the strange, new and hitherto unexperienced: the most habitual explanations.38 A safe life requires safe truths. The strange and the alien remain unexamined, the unknown becomes identified as evil, and evil provokes hostility—recycling the desire for security. The "influence of timidity," as Nietzsche puts it, creates a people who are willing to subordinate affirmative values to the "necessities" of security: "they fear change, transitoriness: this expresses a straitened soul, full of mistrust and evil experiences."39 The unknowable which cannot be contained by force or explained by reason is relegated to the off-world. "Trust," the "good," and other common values come to rely upon an "artificial strength": "the feeling of security such as the Christian possesses; he feels strong in being able to trust, to be patient and composed: he owes this artificial strength to the illusion of being protected by a god."40 For Nietzsche, of course, only a false sense of security can come from false gods: "Morality and religion belong altogether to the psychology of error, in every single case, cause and effect are confused; or truth is confused with the effects of believing something 10 be true; or a state of consciousness is confused with its »4l causes. Nietzsche's interpretation of the origins of religion can shed some light on this paradoxical origin and transvaluation of security. In The Gencalo gy of Morals, Nietzsche sees religion arising from a sense of fear and indebtedness to ones ancestors: The conviction reigns that it is only through the sacrifices and accomplish-ments of the ancestors that the tribe exists—and that one has to pay them back with sacrifices and accomplishments: one thus recognizes a debt that constantly grows greater, since these forebears never cease, in their contin-ued existence as powerful spirits, to accord the tribe new advantages and new strength/2 Sacrifices, honors, obedience arc given but it is never enough, for The ancestors of the most powerful tribts are bound eventually to grow to monstrous dimensions through the imagination of growing fear and to recede into the darkness of the divinely uncanny and unimaginable: in the end the ancestor must necessarily be transfigured into a god.4i As the ancestors debt becomes embedded in institutions, the community takes on the role of creditor. Nietzsche mocks this originary, Hobbesian moment: One lives in a community, one enjoys the advantages of communality (oh what advantages! we sometimes underrate them today), one dwells protected, cared for, in peace and trustfulness, without fear of certain injuries and hostile acts to which the man outside, the "man without peace," is exposed . . . since one has bound and pledged oneself to the community precisely with a view to injury and hostile acts.44 The establishment of the community is dependent upon, indeed it feeds upon, this fear of being left outside. As the castle wall is replaced by written treaty, however, and distant gods by temporal sovereigns, the martial skills and spiritual virtues of the noble warrior are slowly debased and dissimulated. The subject of the individual will to power becomes the object of a collective resentment. The result? The fear of the external other is transvalued into the "love of the neighbor" quoted in the opening of this section, and the perpetuation of community is assured through the internalization and legitimation of a fear that lost its original source long ago. This powerful nexus of fear, of external and internal otherness, generates the values which uphold the security imperative. Indeed, Nietzsche locates the genealogy of even individual rights, such as freedom, in the calculus of maintaining security: - My rights - are that pan of my power which others not merely conceded me, but which they wish me to preserve. How do these others arrive at that? First: through their prudence and fear and caution: whether in that they expect something similar from us in return (protection of their rights); or in that they consider that a struggle with us would be perilous or to no purpose; or in that they sec in any diminution of our force a disadvantage to themselves, since we would then be unsuited to forming an alliance with them in opposition to a hostile third power. Then: by donation and cession.45 The point of Nietzsche's critical genealogy is to show that the perilous conditions that created the security imperative—and the western metaphysics that perpetuate it—have diminished if not disappeared; yet, the fear of life persists: "Our century denies this perilousncss, and docs so with a good conscience: and yet it continues to drag along with it the old habits of Christian security. Christian enjoyment, recreation and evaluation."46 Nietzsche's worry is that the collective reaction against older, more primal fears has created an even worse danger the tyranny of the herd, the lowering of man, the apathy of the last man which controls through conformity and rules through passivity. The security of the sovereign, rational self and state comes at the cost of ambiguity, uncertainty, paradox—all that makes a free life worthwhile. Nietzsche's lament for this lost life is captured at the end of Daybreak in a series of rhetorical questions: Of future virtues—How comes it that the more comprehensible the world has grown the more solemnities of every kind have decreased? Is it that fear was so much the basic clement of that reverence which overcame us in the presence of everything unknown and mysterious and taught us to fall down before the incomprehensible and plead tor mercy? And has the world not lost some of its charm for us because we have grown less fearful? With the diminution of our fearrulness has our own dignity and solemnity, our own fiarsomeness, not also diminished?47 It is of course in Nietzsche's lament, in his deepest pessimism for the last man, that one finds the celebration of the overman as both symptom and harbinger of a more free-spirited yet fearsome age. Dismissive of Utopian engineering, Nietzsche never suggests how he would restructure society; he looks forward only so far as to sight the emergence of "new philosophers" (such as himself?) who would restore a reverence for fear and reevaluate the security imperative. Nietzsche does, however, go back to a pre-Christian, pre-Socratic era to find the exemplars for a new kind of securi iv. In The Genealogy of Morals^ he holds up Pericles as an example, for lauding the Athenians for their "rhatbymia"—a term that incorporates the notion of "indifference to and contempt for security."48 It is perhaps too much to expect Nietzsche's message to resonate in late modern times, to expect, at the very time when conditions seem most uncertain and unpredictable, that people would treat fear as a stimulus for improvement rather than cause for retrenchment. Yet Nietzsche would clearly see these as opportune times, when fear could be willfully asserted as a force for the affirmation of difference, rather than canalized into a cautious identity constructed from the calculation of risks and benefits.

# Part 2 is the Contention

#### Patient autonomy is a prerequisite to effective self-creation

**Madder 97**

Hillary Madder (John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford). “Existential autonomy: why patients should make their own choices.” Journal of Medical Ethics. 1997. http://europepmc.org/backend/ptpmcrender.fcgi?accid=PMC1377270&blobtype=pdf

Patient choice and existential autonomy A major conceptual objection to rational non-interventional paternalism is its implication for patient autonomy. Savulescu's model prescribes the moral commitment of doctors "to convince their patients by rational argument that what they are advocating is the best course". The "non-interventional" condition, which "forswears doing what is best", is possibly an attempt to distance the model from old-style paternalism, but I am not sure that paternalism relies upon achievement of intended outcome for its definition. Indeed the model could be viewed as an extreme form of paternalism, that is, paternalism in an "overall sense", whereby the doctor prescribes not only what he judges is best for the patient in a medical sense, but what he judges is best for the patient's life as a whole. The threat to patient autonomy lies in the denial of the patient's responsibility for whole-life decisions. Responsibility for oneself is in my view central to autonomy. By taking responsibility for decisions which affect our lives, we maintain our discreteness as self and enable self-realisation.4 It is the act of making a decision which promotes self-being. I will call this view "existential autonomy".

Because the body is a representation of people and their projection of their identity, autonomy over medical decisions is inextricably tied to existential self-creation – that’s a reason to affirm.

#### And don’t bite the bullet on brain studies, there’s a difference between cognitive and psychosocial maturity—the former entails that teenage medical decisions are mature and thus their decisions are to be respected, arguments to the contrary conflate the two types of maturity.

**Steinberg 13**

Laurence Steinberg (PhD, Department of Psychology, Temple University). “Does Recent Research on Adolescent Brain Development Inform the Mature Minor Doctrine?” Oxford University Press. 2013.

The importance of maintaining a distinction between cognitive and psychosocial maturity in discussions of the legal status of adolescents is supported by other research that has examined age differences in each of these domains. Studies that have examined basic information processing skills and logical reasoning, for instance, find no appreciable differences between adolescents who are at least 15 and adults; any gains that take place in these domains during adolescence occur very early in the adolescent decade, and improvements after this age are very small (Hale, 1990; Kail, 1997; Keating, 2004; Overton, 1990). This general pattern, indicating that adolescents attain adult levels of competence to make decisions somewhere around age 15, has been reported in similar studies of decision-making across a wide variety of domains (e.g., Grisso, 1980; Grisso et al., 2003; Jacobs-Quadrel, Fischhoff, and Davis, 1993) and in many studies of age differences in individuals’ competence to provide informed consent (Belter and Grisso, 1984; Grisso and Vierling, 1978; Gustafson and McNamara, 1987; Weithorn and Campbell, 1982). When it comes to decisions that permit more deliberative, reasoned decision-making, where emotional and social influences on judgment are minimized or can be mitigated, and where there are consultants who can provide objective information about the costs and benefits of alternative courses of action, adolescents are likely to be just as capable of mature decision-making as adults, at least by the time they are 15 or so. In contrast, the literature on age differences in psychosocial characteristics such as impulsivity, sensation-seeking, future orientation, and susceptibility to peer pressure shows continued development well beyond middle adolescence and even into young adulthood (Scott, Reppucci, and Woolard, 1995; Steinberg and Cauffman, 1996). Consistent with this, and in contrast to the pattern of age differences seen in the information-processing, logical reasoning, and informed consent literatures, studies of age differences in the sorts of risky behavior likely to be influenced by the psychosocial factors listed above—such as reckless driving, binge drinking, crime, and spontaneous unprotected sex—indicate that risky behavior is significantly more common during late adolescence and early adulthood than after (Steinberg, 2008). In other words, adolescents may demonstrate adult-like levels of maturity in some respects by the time they reach 15, but in other respects they show continued immaturity well beyond this point in development. Taken together, these bodies of neurobiological and behavioral research indicate that it is not prudent to make sweeping statements about the relative maturity of adolescents and adults, because the answer to the question of whether adolescents are as mature as adults depends on the aspects of maturity under consideration. Based on extant research, it seems reasonable to distinguish between two very different decision-making contexts in this regard: those that allow for unhurried, logical reflection and those that do not. It is also in keeping with our emerging understanding of adolescent brain maturation, which suggests that brain systems responsible for logical reasoning and basic information processing mature earlier than those that undergird more advanced executive functions and the coordination of affect and cognition necessary for psychosocial maturity (Steinberg, 2008). **In essence, the skills and abilities necessary to make an informed decision about a medical procedure are likely in place several years before the capacities necessary to regulate one’s behavior under conditions of emotional arousal or coercive pressure from peers.**

# Frontlines

## AT Deont

1. Analysis of the world can’t be from an objective perspective. We all have differing opinions on what is ethical, so to make a universal ethical rule under objective meaning doesn’t make sense. And talking about the subjective experience of another is incoherent because we each only have access to ourselves. As a result, it is our own self-defined existential meaning that matters. This means reject practical reason because a) it requires objectivity and b) it imposes on the individual unnecessary order with constitutively describing them as rational, but this is fundamentally absurd. Sartre furthers.

If an angel appears to me, what is the proof that it is an angel; or, **if I hear voices, who can prove that they proceed from heaven and not from** hell, or from **my own subconscious or some pathological condition?** Who can prove that they are really addressed to me?**Who, then, can prove that I am the proper person to impose, by my own choice, my conception of man upon mankind?**I shall never find any proof whatever; there will be no sign to convince me of it. If a voice speaks to me, **it is still I myself who must decide whether the voice is** or is not **that of an angel. If I regard a certain course of action as good, it is only I who choose to say that it is good and not bad.**

1. Subjugating the individual to a higher moral power such as the Kantian Will and becoming constitutively a moral agent means living in bad faith as you are denying yourself your own freedom to act and create your own meaning for yourself. The mission of man is to define himself in relation to his universe, but the AC framing makes this impossible.
2. And even absent my framework, my human worthlessness impact from Der Derian is worse than any other impact under any framework, because while pain or death may destroy a life, worthlessness removes it from existence.
3. **And the 1AC framing uniquely can bridge the gap between facticity—making moral claims based on the empirically observable—and transcendence—making moral claims based on breaking beyond the empirical with nonnatural reasoning. This distinction metaethically comes first for it only can answer what it means to be human with morality. Humanity is defined by radical freedom, it being our choice whether or not to obey anything, a factical account would confine our infinite humanity. But as man also defines himself based on internalizing empirics of the world to create an identity, transcendental moral theories like deontology fail because they require some unprovable external fact to motivate our actions. But my AC framing solves this divide by emphasizing the exercise of freedom within the limits of human existence. De Beauvoir 47:**

Simone De Beauvoir (Feminist, Existentialist, Badass) “The Ethics of Ambiguity” 1947. https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/ambiguity/ch02.htm

**Ethics is the triumph of freedom over facticity, and the sub- man feels only the facticity of his existence. Instead of aggrandizing the reign of the human, he opposes his inert resistance to the projects of other men. No project has meaning in the world disclosed by such an existence. Man is defined as a wild flight. The world about him is bare and incoherent. Nothing ever happens; nothing merits desire or effort. The sub-man makes his way across a world deprived of meaning toward a death which merely confirms his long negation of himself**. The only thing revealed in this experience is the absurd facticity of an existence which remains forever unjustified if it has not known how to justify itself. The sub-man experiences the desert of the world in his boredom. And the strange character of a universe with which he has created no bond also arouses fear in him. Weighted down by present events, he is bewildered before the darkness of the future which is haunted by frightful specters, war, sickness, revolution, fascism, bolshevism. The more indistinct these dangers are, the more fearful they become. **The sub-man is not very clear about what he has to lose, since he has nothing, but this very uncertainty re-enforces his terror. Indeed, what he fears is that the shock of the unforeseen may remind him of the agonizing consciousness of himself.**

## AT Existentialism Kills Freedom

#### Their evidence misunderstands Sartre

**Manzi 13**

Yvonne Manzi (University of Kent). “Jean-Paul Sartre: Existential “Freedom” and the Political.” E-International Relations Students. January 23rd, 2013. <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/01/23/jean-paul-sartre-existential-freedom-and-the-political/>

Freedom for Sartre is not the freedom to do something. He says “you are free” because you always have a choice, “therefore choose” (Sartre 2007). But because this creates anxiety and anguish, individuals flee in self-deception and continue leading inauthentic lives. Man is free when his consciousness acknowledges that something is lacking, when he makes a purpose of himself, and when he commits. In Sartre’s words, this is when he “transcends” himself. This was done well under occupation because what was lacking then was evident, almost palpable. Consequently, he argues, every action became a commitment. Man was thus asserting his freedom. He does not seek to say that individuals in peacetime are under illusory freedom. In peacetime they simply do not think about the same issues, and they are much less likely to realise what to be human truly means. Possible critics of this approach to freedom[13] might point out that Sartre’s conception of freedom does not ensure actual freedom for individuals. In addition, it may be misinterpreted (perhaps even purposefully) to justify the restriction of political freedoms.[14] This, for Sartre, stems from “a misunderstanding: the empirical and popular concept of ‘freedom’ which has been produced by historical, political, and moral circumstances is equivalent to ‘the ability to obtain the ends chosen.’ The technical and philosophical concept of freedom, the only one which we are considering here, means only the autonomy of choice”[15] (Sartre 1943, 483). I interpret this to mean that Sartre is not declaring that we should dismiss the ‘empirical and popular concept of freedom’, but rather that we should first structure a good understanding of the ‘technical and philosophical concept of freedom’, upon which one may then build a political concept of freedom.

## AT ROTB

#### All policy judgments are a manifestation of existential choices—recognizing this is a prereq to meaningful debates—denying this is dehumanizing

**Wachs 11**

Benjamin Wachs (Saybrook University's Director of Communication, Benjamin is the editor of The New Existentialists. He received his MA in linguistics from Purdue, and has received numerous awards for journalism). “Policy positions are, at heart, an existential choice.” The New Existentialists. November 23rd, 2011. https://www.saybrook.edu/newexistentialists/posts/11-23-11

Periodically someone will publish the results of a study suggesting that “we” are smarter than our political enemies. Liberals are more open to new ideas, conservatives have more common sense – somehow the idea that our political beliefs are determined by our IQ lets some of us sleep easier at night. Daniel Klein isn’t one of them. The author of a 2010 study showing that conservatives are smarter about economics than liberals, Klein has publicly retracted his own study after conducting follow-up research. It turns out that conservatives correctly answer questions whose conclusions back up conservatives views on how the world works … and liberals correctly answer questions who conclusions back of liberal views of how the world works. And everyone is bad at answering questions that challenge their assumptions. Klein writes: “The proper inference from our work is not that one group is more enlightened, or less. It’s that “myside bias”—the tendency to judge a statement according to how conveniently it fits with one’s settled position—is pervasive among all of America’s political groups.” It would be nice if we could do away with the idea that people who disagree with us are of necessity stupid, or immune to evidence: the current Pope is brilliant, as is Richard Dawkins. Barack Obama is extremely intelligent, as is Mitch Daniels. Attempts to reduce their choices to a deficiency of capacity is a kind of dehumanization: it’s not their fault, they can’t help themselves. Any debate that does this is fundamentally dishonest: we all have agency. To deny it of our opponents is, deep down, a refusal to engage. But these results also suggest that, at heart, the reason why we believe what we do about politics and public policy has less to do with cold calculations and more to do with our fundamental values: at some point we decide the world works a certain way, and our intellectual opinions follow. Our politics, then, are a manifestation of our existential choices. Realizing this could do a great deal to cool down the overheated rhetoric that has so often come to replace public debate: we will never be able to change someone’s mind unless we can truly understand how (and why) they choose to live. The more hostile we get, the less likely we are to see what’s right in front of our opponents’ eyes. What we must not do is use the existence of “myside bias” to give up on debate. Because no existential choice is set in stone: we make choices every moment of our lives, and people do indeed “change their minds” when exposed to new evidence. Klein himself proves that. Noted ethicist (and Saybrook University faculty member) Marvin Brown has pointed out the fact that values are not, at heart, questions of intellect doesn’t absolve us of the need to develop our intellects. We still need to have a way of reaching out to people we disagree with, and the realm of logic and evidence is where those first encounters happen. What Klein’s courageous admission has shown us is that the purpose of intellectual debate is not just to understand policy and politics, but to better humanize the people who make these choices – including ourselves.

## AT Informed Consent

#### More information doesn’t improve adolescent decision-making. Radical freedom means the CP solves nothing. Fischhoff 08:

Baruch Fischhoff, pf @ Carnegie Mellon, “Assessing adolescent decision-making competence” Developmental Review 28 (2008) 12–28

A question that occupies many people concerned about teens’ welfare is, ‘‘Does information work?’’, as a way to improve teens’ decision making. From a behavioral decision research perspective, there can be no simple answer. In some situations, teens would not change their choices, whatever (truthful) information they received. In those cases, information has ‘‘worked,’’ leading them to stable decisions (Reyna & Farley, 2006). Those choices might not please people who disapproved of the values that those decisions embodied; however, **the problem would not be how teens had used the information.** Stable choices might not even please the teens making them, if they wished that they had better options (e.g., those unable to stop smoking or escape abusive
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